

AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are pending.

Claims 1-4 have been amended.

Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claims 6-8 have been withdrawn.

Claims 9-10 have been added.

Support for the amendments is found in the claims and specification (page 3, lines 22-23; page 5, lines 20-26; page 4), as originally filed.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

The claimed navel cavity cleansing agent is either poured into or applied to a navel cavity, solidifies after a specified period of time and takes a form that can be removed from said navel cavity together with dirt in said navel cavity, wherein the viscosity of said navel cavity cleansing agent is not greater than 3,000 mPa.s.

The claimed cleansing agent removes dirt such as bellybutton lint or ear wax and can be easily removed without hurting the inner surface of the navel cavity (page 2 of the present specification).

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102() over Edgerton et al., US 4,412,096, as evidenced by “Questions”, page 7, paragraph 4, “Protocol for Earmold Impression” and Schwabe et al., US 4,891,400. The rejection is traversed because the cited references do not describe or suggest (a) a navel cleansing agent (b) having a relatively low viscosity, (c) that the agent can remove dirt from the navel cavity, and (d) the cleansing agent of claims 9-10.

Edgerton et al. describe a fast-setting flexible *earmold* made of elastomeric materials comprising parts (A) and (B). Part (A) comprises a dimethyl vinyl chain-stopped polydimethyl siloxane copolymers (col. 3, lines 53-68), a silica filler, a calcium carbonate

filler, mineral oil, and a hydride containing trimethyl endblocked polysiloxane (col. 4, lines 1-19). Part (B) comprises a dimethyl vinyl chain-stopped polydimethyl siloxane copolymers of part (A), a silica filler, a calcium carbonate filler, mineral oil, and a platinum catalyst (col. 4, lines 20-36).

The Examiner has cited US Patent No. 4,891,400 as disclosing a trimethyl endblocked polysiloxane of col. 4, lines 5-15, of Edgerton et al. as a cross-linking agent.

The Examiner has also cited “Questions”, page 7, paragraph 4, to show that an earmold composition can be applied to a human ear and can be sticky.

It is noted that “Questions” do not describe or suggest removing dirt from ears with an earmold. “Questions” describes that oil prevents the silicon from sticking to the skin (page 7, paragraph 3). Thus, oil can also prevent dirt from sticking to the silicon (i.e., oil prevents removing dirt with the mold).

The Examiner has also cited “Protocol for Earmold Impression” to show that an earmold can remove wax/debris adhered to the mold from human ears.

It is noted that the Examiner has not provided a publication date of “Protocol for Earmold Impression” and, therefore, cannot be used as evidence in the rejection.

In addition, “Questions” and “Protocol for Earmold Impression” do not describe that dirt form the navel cavity (which is different from ear wax or ear debris) can be removed with the Edgerton et al. cleansing agent.

Also, the viscosity of the claimed navel cleansing agent is relatively low compared to that of, for example, the commonly used dental/ear molding agents.

The cited references do not describe or suggests selecting the claimed viscosity.

Also, the viscosity of an earmold composition is not necessarily the same as the viscosity of a cleansing composition for navel cavity.

Lastly, the cited references do not describe a navel cleansing agent comprising a reactive silicone base and a crosslinking agent in the specific combination, i.e., a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two hydroxyl groups in the molecule and an alkoxy silane containing at least two alkoxy groups in the molecule (as in claims 9-10).

Thus, Edgerton et al. do not anticipate the claimed navel cavity cleansing agent.

Edgerton et al. do not make the claimed navel cleansing agent obvious because one would not have been motivated with a reasonable expectation of success to use the Edgerton et al. earmold composition for cleansing a navel cavity.

Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 are rejected as obvious over Edgerton et al., Fujiki et al., US 5,360,858, Arkles, US 4,714,739, and McDermott et al., US 5,674,966. The rejection is traversed because the combination of the references does not describe or suggest (a) a navel cleansing agent (b) having a relatively low viscosity, (c) that the agent can remove dirt from the navel cavity, and (d) the specific claimed combination of a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two hydroxyl groups in the molecule and an alkoxy silane containing at least two alkoxy groups in the molecule (as in claims 9-10).

Claim 4 is directed to a body cavity cleansing agent comprising (i) a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two hydroxyl groups and an alkoxy silane containing at least two alkoxy groups, or (ii) a vinyl-terminated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two vinylic groups and a hydrogenated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two Si-H groups.

Edgerton et al. describe a combination of a vinyl-terminated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two vinylic groups and trimethyl endblocked polysiloxane (comprises Si-H groups).

Fujiki et al. describe that a silicon rubber can comprise a vinyl-terminated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two vinyl groups and a hydrogenated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two Si-H groups (col. 2-3).

The Examiner has relied on Arkles and McDermott et al. to show that substituting a trimethyl endblocked polysiloxane of Edgerton et al. with a hydrogenated diorganopolysiloxane of Fujiki et al. is obvious because both compounds are cross-linking compounds comprising Si-H groups and that a molar excess of hydride to alkenyl improves a formulation.

In response, it is noted that the combination of the references still does not describe or suggest that dirt form the navel cavity (which is different from ear wax or ear debris) can be removed with the cleansing agent of the cited references.

It is also noted that “Questions” do not describe or suggest removing dirt with the earmold. “Questions” describes that oil prevents the silicon from sticking to the skin (page 7, paragraph 3). Thus, oil can also prevent dirt from sticking to the silicon (i.e., oil can prevent removing ear wax with the mold).

The Examiner has also cited “Protocol for Earmold Impression” to show that an earmold can remove wax/debris adhered to the mold from human ears.

The Examiner has not provided a publication date of “Protocol for Earmold Impression” and, therefore, cannot be used as evidence in the rejection.

In addition, “Questions” and “Protocol for Earmold Impression” do not describe that dirt form the navel cavity (which is different from ear wax or ear debris) can be removed with the Edgerton et al. cleansing agent.

One would not have been motivated with a reasonable exception of success to use the composition of the cited references for removing ear wax, not to mentioned, dirt from the navel cavity, based on the disclosure of the cited references because (i) the composition of the

cited references is used for an earmold, (ii) the references do not suggest that dirt can be removed by the earmold and/or navel mold, and (iii) ear wax is not necessarily the same as dirt of the navel cavity.

Further, the viscosity of the claimed navel cleansing agent is relatively low compared to that of, for example, the commonly used dental/ear molding agents. The cited references do not describe or suggests selecting the claimed viscosity.

Also, the viscosity of an earmold composition is not necessarily the same as the viscosity of a cleansing composition for navel cavity.

In addition, the cited references do not describe a combination of a hydroxylated diorganopolysiloxane containing at least two hydroxyl groups and an alkoxy silane containing at least two alkoxy groups (as in claims 9-10).

Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants submitted Information Disclosure Statements on January 20, 2006 and November 21, 2006. However, the Examiner has not considered JP 2000-229045 and JP 2002-34830 listed in the IDS of January 20, 2006. Applicants submit English abstracts of JP 2000-229045 and JP 2002-34830 with this paper and request that JP 2000-229045 and JP 2002-34830 be considered and a signed and initialed copy of the IDS submitted on January 20, 2006 be forwarded to Applicants.

The Examiner has not considered JP 9-205699 listed on the IDS submitted on November 23, 2006 allegedly because Applicants had not provided a relevancy statement. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submitted JP 9-205699 and an English translation of a Notice of Rejection (mailed August 22, 2006) which describes a disclosure of JP 9-205699 (designated as Reference 1) in paragraph “Remarks” on November 21, 2006. Applicants request that JP 9-

Application No. 10/553,783  
Reply to Office Action of November 14, 2008

205699 be considered and a signed and initialed copy of the IDS submitted on November 21, 2006 be forwarded to Applicants.

A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon

*M. Miller*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marina I. Miller, Ph.D.  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 59,091

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)